

**REMARKS**

This paper is submitted in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed October 6, 2010. Claims 50, 56–58, 61, 63, 65–68, 76–78, 80–82, 89, and 97–99 are amended to clarify the scope of the claims and to correct minor typographical errors. Claims 51, 55, 62, 64, 79 and 83 are cancelled without prejudice, with claims 1–49 previously cancelled without prejudice.

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner required election of a single invention from the following groups:

- Group I, claims 50–77, drawn to a polymer article
- Group II, claims 78–98, drawn to a method of dispersing an inorganic particulate material in a polymer.

Applicants elect Group I, claims 50–77, for further prosecution. The election is made with traverse.

The Examiner contends that unity of invention under PCT Rule 13.1 is not maintained between the two groups of inventions above, because the special technical feature that links the two groups is anticipated by the prior art, and specifically by US 4,471,009, US 6,203,906, WO 00/052105 and/or US 6,046,267.

Applicants disagree with this contention, and note that the claims, as amended herein, are novel and inventive in view of the cited prior art. Specifically, Applicants note that the independent claims have been amended to recite particle size from 1 nm up to 1000 nm. Independent claim 50 requires that the polymer article be substantially free of gas bubbles. Gas bubbles are increasingly difficult to remove from a system with decreasing particle size as recited in the present claims. The cited prior art references do not teach or suggest articles or methods that result in a polymer article substantially free of gas bubbles. Therefore, Applicants submit the independent claims share a special technical feature that is both novel and inventive over the cited prior art, and unity of

Response dated November 8, 2010

Reply to Restriction Requirement of October 6, 2010

invention is maintained between the two groups of claims. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit the Application is in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' primary attorney-of-record, Brian H. Batzli (Reg. No. 32,960) at (612) 336-4755.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: 8 November 2010



Brian H. Batzli  
Reg. No. 32,960  
BHB:HLV:jrm

23552

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE